

## REMARKS

Claims 1-174 are pending in the present application as amended, with claims 1, 2, 27, 48, 64, 78-80, 105, 126, 142, and 156-166 being the independent claims. In summary of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-166 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 79, 157, and 162 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-166 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lau in view of Lindhorst et al. in further view of Admitted Prior Art.

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections to the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks and amendments.

### *Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112*

Claims 1, 79, 157, and 162 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Applicant has amended these claims to directly include material to address the issues raised by the rejection. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections for these claims is earnestly solicited.

### *Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103*

Claims 1-166 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,247 (Lau) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,337,696 (Lindhorst et al.) in further view of alleged admitted prior art (APA) by Applicant.

Also, the Office Action alleges that it was APA to “bind the compiled modified input files with the compiled web application source code at runtime.” The Office Actions refers to the background language of the patent application regarding interpretation of application code files at runtime. In particular, the background language states “all application files are later interpreted at runtime,” on page 3, lines 2-3. However, binding involves associating *input files* with *code* as claim 1 states “binding the compiled modified input files with the compiled web application source code at runtime.” The portion of the background on which the Office Action relies does not mention input files or binding, just interpretation.

In response to this argument, the Office Action stated “Lau shows input files in at least the paragraph of column 5, lines 30-39.” However, Lau states using file objects “as part of the framework,” but not specifically input files. The Office Action also states “Lau also demonstrates JAVA and JAVA has byte code, script code along with runtime compiling and binding often found in web pages.” However, Lau does not describe using JAVA in this way to specifically bind “the compiled modified input files with the compiled web application source code at runtime.” Lau only makes a general statement that the invention enables building a JAVA framework. Also, the Office Action states that “interpretation of scripting code and web HTML interfaces,” is in other words “binding at runtime code with input interface and design files.” Applicants respectfully disagree. An interpreter converts instructions in a computer program written in a high level language into machine language and execute them, one instruction at a time. This is different than binding which is not execution instruction by instruction, but creates associations with the input files and compiled web application source code.

Also, The Office Action states that “generating an event handler skeleton” is disclosed by Lau in column 5, lines 33-40 and column 13, lines 28-44. However, column 5, lines 33-40 do not speak of generating an event handler skeleton, but describes that “generation of the initial framework...corresponds to a design and editing of the initial framework,” and that the framework comprises one or more of various objects, none of which describe an “event handler skeleton.” Column 13, lines 28-44 describes code generation that “generates appropriate methods from OMG object services...,” and the OMG object services refers to the set of object services such as ‘transaction security’, ‘events’ and ‘naming’.” Thus, there is no event handler skeleton described here, only generation of appropriate methods based on object services such as events.

Thus, for the additional reason above, Applicant submits that all the limitations of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., or alleged APA, or any combination thereof.

Regarding claim 2, the Office Action gives the same reason as for claim 1 in alleging that the “binding step” and “generating an event handler skeleton” is described in alleged APA and Lau. Thus, Applicant submits that all the limitations of claim 2 are not taught or

DOCKET NO.: IVGP-0002  
Application No.: 09/810,716  
Office Action Dated: May 5, 2005

PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116

suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., alleged APA, or any combination thereof for the same reason shown above with respect to the "binding" step.

Regarding claim 3-166, they either depend from claim 1 or 2, or were rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 or 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that all the limitations of claims 2-166 are not taught or suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., alleged APA, or any combination thereof, for the same reasons presented above.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP § 2142. Since all the limitations of claims 1-166 are not taught or suggested by Lau, Lindhorst et al., alleged APA, or any combination thereof, as shown above, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for claims 1-166 is earnestly solicited.

#### *New Claims 167-174*

Dependent claims 167-174 have been added in the present amendment. Support for these claims appears throughout the patent application as originally filed, such as, for example, in claims 1, 7 and 30. No new matter has been added. Applicant submits claims 166-174 are allowable for the same reasons as presented above for the claims from which they depend.

#### CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each point raised by the Examiner in the office action and Applicants submit that claims 1-174 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: August 5, 2005



Jeremiah J. Baunach  
Registration No. 44,527

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439